1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

United States of	America, Plaintiff,))
v. Edward Sullivan,	ramerr,))) No. CR-09-0167-DLJ)
	Defendant.) ORDER))

In an order dated April 19, 2011 this Court requested that the Glen Dyer facility permit defendant Sullivan to participate in the pro per program in accordance with any regulations of the facility governing such program. An issue has now arisen as to defendant's inclusion in that program and therefore his telephone access at the facility.

Defendant has filed a Motion for Court Ordered Phone Calls. In that Motion he requests that he be granted two hours a week of telephone time. The County Sheriff's Office has responded that because Sullivan has co-counsel in the case, they do not consider him to be a pro per and thus eligible for inclusion in the pro per program with its telephone access. Additionally, in the pleading counsel makes reference to the limited resources of the Glenn Dyer Jail facility.

The Court is mindful of the restricted resources of the Glenn Dyer Jail. Nonetheless, after a hearing on the matter back in April of 2011, the Court specifically held that Defendant Edward Sullivan acted as co-counsel throughout the entirety of his trial and found that he wished to continue to act as his own counsel, with the assistance of co-counsel for the remainder of the proceedings. The Court believes that this finding, and the subsequent Order of the Court affirming that finding, distinguishes Sullivan's situation from those incarcerated at the Glenn Dyer facility who may wish to claim that they are pro se when in fact they are represented by counsel.

As Sullivan has and continues to represent himself in this case, the Court believes it appropriate for him to have phone access to the same extent and in the same manner that the Glenn Dyer facility accords any inmate representing himself.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 9, 2011

United States District Judge